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**Revisions**

Identify or describe revisions you have made or intend to make as a result of your formative evaluation. Be specific and identify the slides involved with these revisions.

*Eight of the previous nine PowerPoint presentations were discarded. Some of the slides from the original nine were included in the new slenderized version of the training module, for example slides 1, 11, 12, 13, 14. Approximately 30 new slides and submenus were added (for example, slides 2, 10, 15, 16, 24, 27, 29-46, 54-59, 72). Navigation diagrams were added (slides 4-9) and navigation was restricted to smaller areas with makeover of the main menu (slide 3) and the use of submenus at slides 10, 16, and 24. 15-20 narrated screencasts were added (for example, slides 27, 29, 35, 37, 56, 61, 63, 65). Downloads were switched to websites because of difficulties that the testers had (for example slide 24, 64, 67, and 70).*

*Data collection was initially via the macros function in PowerPoint. But for unknown reasons, when test subjects opened the document, they were immediately given an error message regarding the macros. To avoid further frustration on the part of the test subjects, the macros was removed and instead used SurveyMonkey, a web-based survey tool. This tool has similar data collection tools as the macros function in PowerPoint.*

*On a side note, based on this week’s election of new curriculum committee co-chairpersons for AY 2012-2013, the development of this module for course outline proposers will be placed on a backburner while a new module for training the co-chairs will be given priority.*

**e3 Findings**

Describe the effectiveness, efficiency and engagement of your project as reflected by your formative evaluation study.

Module 13 contained the following suggestion: **“**You may also want to modify your functional prototype to compare two or more instructional strategy alternatives and to randomly assignment learners to these alternative treatments.”

*The most efficient would seem to be the Tell with step-by-step and checklists, but only if the learner likes lists. Otherwise the seemingly efficient becomes less effective because the learner chooses not to be engaged. Therefore, a more efficient future module would allow the learner to select from Tell, Show, or Do for each activity and have the option of selecting more than one method if the first choice was not sufficient. Random assignment to alternative treatments might work if the test subject were being compensated, but is more difficult with volunteers.*

**Treatments**

Describe and illustrate each of the treatments you included in your functional prototype. Identify the slides in your module that implement each treatment.

*Tell: an instructional interaction that provides information to the learner.*

*slides 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 28, 29, 31, 33, 35, 37, 39, 41, 43, 45, 47, 49, 54, 56, 58, 61, 62, 64, 67, 70*

*Show: an instructional interaction that displays portrayals to the learner.*

*slides 27, 29, 35, 37, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 56, 64, 67, 70*

*Do: an instructional interaction that requires learners to apply information to a portrayal.*

*slides 30, 32, 34, 36, 38, 40, 42, 44, 46, 55, 57, 59, 63, 65, 68, 71*

**Measures**

Identify application slides used to collect performance data.  
 Identify attitude, effort and other data collected to assess learner engagement.

Identify any time measurements collected.

*Data had to be collected manually because the test subjects had Macs or had older versions of PowerPoint. SurveyMonkey was used to develop a survey for demographical and attitudinal data.*

**Results**

Report the means for each treatment for each measure.

Report what you learned from comparing the treatments.

*In order to avoid frustration on the part of the volunteers, test subjects who had difficulty with any less preferred way of learning were switched to a preferred way of learning. Thus, the comparison of treatments would not be valid. The current database already has urban legends of being difficult to master and we did not want to add fuel to the fire. If the test subject preferred being told what to do or being given a checklist to follow then that was provided. If the test subject preferred to be shown what to do then that was provided. If the test subject was more comfortable with a combination that included doing something in the test database then more chances to practice making course proposals was encouraged. The built-in peer review and critique part of the module was a failure as it was perceived to be too time consuming. Test subjects balked at the extra time that would be involved in reviewing a course proposal by a colleague. They will be asked by their department chair or their committee chair to do the review for real courses in real life. The timing of the module testing (immediately prior to the last week of instruction and finals) was a poor choice because of other demands on volunteer subjects free time.*